REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10 through 18, 20, ~~and~~ 21, and 33 are in the application, with claims 1, 9, 12, 19, and 23 having been amended, ~~and~~ claims 4, 5, 14, 15, and 22 through 32 having been cancelled and claim 33 having been added. Claims 1 and 12 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,832,313 ("Parker"). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 12

Amended independent claim 1 discloses a method comprising powering up a client device and initializing a initialization process, determining a clear-text key during the initialization process, and providing the clear-text key to a first network adapter. The first network adapter encrypts the clear-text key and stores the encrypted key. The method continues by receiving the encrypted key at a client device from the first network adaptor where the key is associated with a remote management device, storing an indication at the client device that the key is currently stored at the first network adapter and not at a second network adapter, storing the key at the second network adapter, and storing an indication at the client device that the key is currently stored at the second network adapter and not the first network adapter. Moreover, the client device comprises the first network adapter and the second network adapter, and the client device is to communicate with the remote management device via the first network adapter.

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest a client device comprising a first network adapter and a second network adapter, storing an indication at the client device that a key is currently stored at the first network adapter and not the second adapter, storing the key at

7

the second network adapter, and storing an indication at the client device that the key is currently stored at the second network adapter and not the first network adapter.

Parker discloses a system comprising a central computer and a remote computer that communicate over a link. Parker discloses, at column 3, lines 10 – 41, that "once a message encryption key has been established it can be cached at either end of the link so that it can immediately be used for encrypting transmitted messages and decrypting messages." However, Parker does not disclose that the cache is located on a network adapter.

Furthermore, in FIG. 1, and in FIG 2., Parker does not disclose or suggest a node that comprises a first network adapter and a second network adapter and therefore Parker can not disclose or suggest storing an indication at the client device that a key is currently stored at the first network adapter and not the second adapter. Therefore, Parker also does not disclose or suggest storing an indication at the client device that the key is currently stored at the second network adapter and not the first network adapter.

Accordingly, nowhere can Parker be seen to disclose or suggest a client device comprising a first network adapter and a second network adapter, storing an indication at the client device that a key is currently stored at the first network adapter and not the second adapter, storing the key at the second network adapter, and storing an indication at the client device that the key is currently stored at the second network adapter and not the first network adapter.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Amended independent claim 12 roughly corresponds to amended independent claim 1. Therefore, amended independent claim 12 and its related dependent claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

C O N C L U S I O N

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

August 10, 2007   /Richard S. Finkelstein/
     Date   Richard S. Finkelstein
                                            Registration No. 56,534
                                            Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
                                            Attorneys for Intel Corporation
                                            50 Locust Avenue
                                            New Canaan, CT 06840
                                            (203) 972-4982